

REMARKSRejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,092,729 (Fichet) in view of US 7,207,055 (Hendricks)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-20. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Fichet and Hendricks does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 20. For example, independent claims 1 and 20 recite “protecting said first authorization data *at said master headend*” and Independent claims 8 and 14 recite “a second encryption unit [disposed *in said master headend*] for encrypting said first authorization data.” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Fichet and Hendrick.

Fichet discloses a method of broadcasting a message having a text portion to be communicated to a user, the method including broadcasting the message in the form of an entitlement management message for reception by the user. (Fichet, Abstract)

Hendricks proposes a method of allocating bandwidth for a television program delivery system. The television program delivery system includes a operation center that transports the digital television signals to the cable headend where the received signals are decoded, demultiplexed, and then transmitted to set top terminals located in subscriber’s home over the cable system. (Hendricks, Abstract and col. 6, lines 27-40)

Applicant’s independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 describe protecting or encrypting authorization data at a master headend. For example, referring to paragraph [0019] of Applicant’s specification as filed, Applicant recites “[t]he master headend generates one or more digital transport streams for conveying the protected content services (e.g., the content services and the content authorization data) for distribution to the local headend 104 and the STBs 106...In this manner, the master headend provides centralized satellite-link and content conditional access systems, thereby obviating the need to include encryption components to protect the content in each of the local headends.” So, Applicant’s feature of protecting the authorization data at the master headend obviates the need for re-encrypting the content services at the local headends, as can be appreciated by a person skilled in the art. Further,

Applicant explains in paragraph [0005] explains that “such an architecture [(master headend not including both the protected content services and protected authorization data in the digital transport stream)] is costly, however, as an encryption system is required at each of the local headend to perform the re-encryption process.”

The Office Action dated March 24, 2009, in item 3, pages 3, 7, 10, and 13 states that Fichet teaches protecting/encrypting authorization data. However, the Office Action is silent on Applicant’s claimed language of “protecting said first authorization data *at said master headend*.” The Office Action appears to refer to Hendricks as describing Applicant’s master headend. Applicant submits that the combination of Fichet and Hendricks fails to teach or suggest Applicant’s claimed feature of protecting/encrypting authorization data at a master headend. In col. 7, lines 19-22, Fichet at best describes that the “access criteria and control word are transmitted to the second encrypting unit 42 via the linkage. In this second encrypting unit 42, the ECM is generated, encrypted, and transmitted on to the multiplexer and scrambler 4.” However, Fichet does not teach or suggest that such encrypting unit 42 is a part of a master headend portion of a digital television system. As is known in the art, Fichet’s encrypting unit does not represent a central station that provides television services to numerous local stations, and therefore cannot be equated to Applicant’s master headend. So, Fichet’s ECM (presumably equated to Applicant’s authorization data) is not being encrypted at a master headend. Hendricks, in col.9, lines 16-24, describes “the operations center 202 has compressed and encoded the program signals and transmitted the signals to the satellite, the cable headend 208 receives and further processes the signals before they are relayed to each set top terminal 220.” However, Hendricks does not teach or suggest anywhere in the reference that an authorization data is also capable of being encrypted in such an operation center 202 (presumably equated to Applicant’s master headend). Neither Fichet nor Hendricks hints at obviating the need for encrypting program signals at local headend by protecting/encrypting authorization data at the master headend. Therefore, Fichet’s teaching of encrypting ECM data at an encryption unit and Hendricks’s teaching of an operation center encrypting program signals are not sufficient to read on Applicant’s claimed feature of “*protecting said first authorization data at said master headend*” as recited in independent claims 1 and 20, and a *second encryption unit [disposed in said master headend] for encrypting said first authorization data*” as recited in independent claims 8 and 14.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 are not obvious in view of the combination of Fichet and Hendricks, and therefore that the rejection of claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-19 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 14 respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-19 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Dated: June 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Larry T. Cullen/
Larry T. Cullen
Registration No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1907